

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XIX, Issue No. 7

January 2014

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

Cellphone data spying: It's not just the NSA

The National Security Agency isn't the only government entity secretly collecting data from people's cellphones. Local police are scooping it up, too.

Armed with mobile devices that tap into cellphone data in real time, local and state police agencies are capturing information about thousands of cellphone users at a time, whether they are targets of an investigation or not, according to records obtained by USA TODAY from more than 125 police agencies in 33 states.

About one in four law-enforcement agencies have used a "tower dump," which gives data about the identity, activity and location of any phone that connects to the targeted cellphone towers. A typical dump covers multiple towers, and wireless providers, and can net information from thousands of phones.

At least 25 police departments own a Stingray, a suitcase-size device that acts as a fake cell tower. The system, typically installed in a vehicle so it can be moved into any neighborhood, tricks all nearby phones into connecting to it and feeding data to police. The federal government funds most of the purchases, via anti-terror grants.

Police maintain that cellphone data can help solve crimes, track fugitives or abducted children or even foil a terror attack.

Organizations such as the American Civil Liberties Union and Electronic Privacy Information Center question the erosion of people's privacy as well as their Fourth Amendment protections against unreasonable search and seizure.

In most states, police can get many kinds of cellphone data without a warrant, which they'd need to search someone's house or car. Many people aren't aware that a smartphone is constantly sending location signals to nearby cell towers, even when not in use. And wireless carriers store data about your device, from where it's been to whom you've called and texted, some of it for years.

The power for police is alluring: a vast data net that can be a cutting-edge crime-fighting tool.

In October 2012, in Colorado, a 10-year-old girl vanished while she walked to school. Local police got a court order for data about every cellphone that connected to five providers' towers on the girl's route. Later, they asked for 15 more cellphone site data dumps. The tower dump data helped police choose about 500 people who were asked to submit DNA samples. The cell-data sweep and DNA samples didn't solve the crime, though the information aided in the prosecution of a 17-year-old who pleaded guilty.

Cities are installing Wi-Fi networks that can record the location and other details about any connecting device.

Police, from Florida to Alaska, are buying Stingrays with federal grants aimed at protecting cities from terror attacks, but using them for far broader police work. With the mobile Stingray, police can get a court order to grab some of the same data available via a tower dump with added benefits: some data from cellphones is obtained in real time without going through the wireless service providers.

Neither tactic — tower dumps or the Stingray devices — captures the content of calls or other communication, according to police. Typically used to hunt a single phone's location, the system intercepts data from all phones within a mile, or farther, depending on terrain and antennas.

Initially developed for military and spy agencies, the Stingrays remain a guarded secret by law enforcement and the manufacturer, Harris Corp. of Melbourne, Fla. Harris requires buyers to sign a non-disclosure agreement.

ACLU lawyer Catherine Crump asks "Is data about people who are not police targets saved or shared with other government agencies?" and "What if a tower dump or Stingray swept up cell numbers and identities of people at a political protest?"

Most of the police agencies said they're not being used for intelligence gathering, only in search of specific targets.

This year, Montana and Maine passed laws requiring police to get a search warrant to access some cellphone data, as they would to search a car or home.

U.S. Rep. Dennis Ross, R-Fla., says Congress needs to clarify the law. -- USA Today December 8, 2013

New book: *Gun Control in the Third Reich: Disarming the Jews and "Enemies of the State"*

By Stephen P. Halbrook

Based on newly-discovered, secret documents from German archives, diaries and newspapers of the time, *Gun Control in the Third*

Reich presents the definitive, yet hidden history of how the Nazi regime made use of gun control to disarm and repress its enemies and consolidate power. The countless books on the Third Reich and the Holocaust fail even to mention the laws restricting firearms ownership, which rendered political opponents and Jews defenseless. A skeptic could surmise that a better-armed populace might have made no difference, but the National Socialist regime certainly did not think so—it ruthlessly suppressed firearm ownership by disfavored groups.

Gun Control in the Third Reich spans the two decades from the birth of the Weimar Republic in 1918 through Kristallnacht in 1938. The book then presents a panorama of pertinent events during World War II regarding the effects of the disarming policies. In the occupied countries the Nazis decreed the death penalty for possession of a firearm.

In a November 7 op-ed in the *Washington Times*, Halbrook writes: "With selective memory of the historical events, a movement currently exists in the United States and Europe that denies the existence of any right to keep and bear arms and argues that firearms should be restricted to the military and the police. Yet considering the premises of that movement, it can hardly be argued that the Nazis disarmed Germany's Jews for benign reasons or that the Jews were better off without firearms in their homes on the basis that firearms are allegedly more dangerous to their owners than to any aggressor. Nor would it be rational to contend that only the discrimination in the Nazi case was wrong and that not just Jews and other persona non grata, but all citizens, should have been disarmed for their own good. The paradigm that government should have a monopoly of small arms implies the surreal normative postulate that citizens – or, rather, subjects – should be treated as the Jews were in Nazi Germany."

Dust-jacket blurbs for the book: "It provides a timely reminder that self-defense and the right to bear arms are fundamental human rights." — Robert Cottrol, George Washington University law professor

* "Halbrook's important research should inform our contemporary debate on gun control." — Steven Bowman, University of Cincinnati professor of Judaic Studies

* "Everyone, including advocates of gun controls, should find this pioneering and thought-provoking book

essential reading." — James Jacobs, New York University law professor

Ed.: When the Nazis came to power, in 1933; they simply made use of the gun control laws passed during the democratically elected Weimar Republic, starting in 1918.

UN Arms Trade Treaty no threat: U.S. Representative

Dear XX December 13, 2013

Thank you for contacting me regarding the United Nations (U.N.) Arms Trade Treaty.

The U.N. General Assembly approved the Arms Trade Treaty on April 2, 2013, by a vote of 155 to 3, with Iran, North Korea, and Syria opposed. The treaty aims to set standards for all cross-border transfers of conventional weapons, such as small arms, battle tanks, and warships. It also requires nations to review all international arms contracts to ensure that weapons of war will not be used to further human-rights abuses, organized crime, or terrorism. While there is no primary enforcement mechanism, this treaty simply aims to bring transparency to international arms transfers, and has no impact on domestic regulation of firearms, despite protests to the contrary.

While I understand that some people may be distrustful of the U.N., I am confident that President Obama, just as all Presidents before him, has and will always put Americans' interests first when negotiating on the international stage. Secretary of State John Kerry made clear that "this treaty applies only to international trade, and reaffirms the sovereign right of any State to regulate arms within its territory. As the United States has required from the outset of these negotiations, nothing in this treaty could ever infringe on the rights of American citizens under our domestic law or the Constitution, including the Second Amendment." Secretary Kerry signed this treaty on September 25, 2013, which will go into force once ratified by 50 nations.

To allay your fears about rumored U.N. interference in U.S. law our Constitution guarantees the right to bear arms, and relevant case law, specifically the 1957 Reid v. Covert Supreme Court ruling, clearly establishes that the Constitution supersedes international treaties ratified by the Senate.

Lastly, since the Constitution dictates the Senate's role in ratifying international treaties, you may wish to

contact [your two senators] in order to share your concerns.

Sincerely,

Ed Pastor, Member of Congress

Moms Demand Action caught lying... Again!

A few days ago, Moms Demand Action triumphantly announced that it has convinced a Staples, located in Arlington, VA, to enact a gun-free zone policy.

This turned out to be a complete and utter lie.

We made a phone call to the store and obtained a recording to confirm this.

Skip to 00:56 for the conversation with a store associate.

Caller: "I've been hearing reports about your store, the particular location, enacting a gun prohibition policy?"

Store: "Yeah, that was a misquote on Facebook. We never had a sign up... They put it in there, and we are trying to get it taken down... But we don't have that sign on the store... They put a bunch of information on Facebook that wasn't accurate." -- Hypocrisy & Stupidity of Gun Control Advocates (hsgca.net Nov. 19, 2013)

Keep Your Powder Dry, Boys

By Tom Hudson

Over the past year it's obvious that shooters have stockpiled ammo at great cost. With this in mind, it is important to protect this investment. A gun is not any good without ammo that works.

There are many ways to store ammunition. Surplus military ammo cans work really well. There are also plastic versions of these called field boxes. These seem to work well. A plastic box with a lid is the least desirable option. The most important aspect of storing ammunition is keeping it in a dry place. Corrosion makes the ammunition less reliable. It never hurts to throw in some desiccant packs to help keep moisture out.

Another ammo killer is the human touch. The oils in your hands can cause the casing to corrode, especially the ammo in your concealed carry firearm. It's important to rotate the round that is in the chamber. If you unload your firearm daily you will be touching this one particular round. It also doesn't help the round to be constantly slammed into battery by the slide, because it sets the bullet deeper into the casing. Also, if you carry a pistol, you need to rotate magazines so as not to ruin the spring, which could

cause failure-to-feed. It is also a good idea to rotate your personal defense ammo regularly. I like to shoot mine once a month and replace it.

It's also best to keep factory ammunition in its original box. If it is at home, store it in your safe. The reason to keep it in its original box is for warranty issues. If you get a bad batch, under-charged or even over-charged, and this damages your gun, the manufacturer will generally replace or fix your gun. But, in order to have the warranty, you will need to have the box that the ammo came in.

Storing .22 ammo requires one more step. Have you ever shot a .22 and it did not go off, but you put in back in the gun, and it went off on the second shot? .22 are rimfire cartridges as you all know. This means that the casing does not have a primer like a centerfire cartridge does. It contains a primer compound that is spread out evenly around the base of the casing. If the round is stored on its side, the primer compound will shift over time and settle to one side. This is why when you shoot a .22 and it doesn't go boom, you can rotate the round 180 degrees and it will fire. So, always store your rimfire round with either the bullet facing up or down—never on its side. Mystery solved:—It is all in the ammo storage.

-- www.gunnews.com Nov. 14, 2013

The [FBI's] Informants

By Trevor Aaronson

Ever since 9/11, counterterrorism has been the FBI's No. 1 priority, consuming \$3.3 billion. The bureau now maintains a roster of 15,000 spies. But for every informant officially listed, there are as many as three unofficial ones, according to one former high-level FBI official.

The FBI's domestic intelligence apparatus could be compared to COINTELPRO, the program the bureau ran from the '50s to the '70s to discredit organizations ranging from the Ku Klux Klan to civil-rights and protest groups.

Today, counterterrorism experts believe groups like Al Qaeda, battered by the war in Afghanistan and the efforts of the global intelligence community, have shifted to the internet to encourage sympathizers to carry out attacks. The main domestic threat, as the FBI sees it, is a lone wolf.

The bureau's strategy is to identify and neutralize potential lone wolves before they act. To that end, FBI agents and informants target not just active jihadists, but tens of

thousands of law-abiding people, seeking to identify those disgruntled few who might participate in a plot. The government provides the plot, the means, and the opportunity.

Here's how it works: Informants report on people who have, say, made statements sympathizing with terrorists. Those names are then cross-referenced against immigration, criminal and other records. FBI agents may then assign an undercover operative to approach the target by posing as a radical. Sometimes the operative proposes a plot, provides explosives, even leads the target in a fake oath to Al Qaeda. Once enough incriminating information has been gathered, there's an arrest—and a press conference announcing another foiled plot.

Such sting operations are a fixture in the headlines. Remember the Washington Metro bombing plot? The New York subway plot? The guys who planned to blow up the Sears Tower? The teenager seeking to bomb a Portland Christmas tree lighting? Each of those plots, and dozens more across the nation, was led by an FBI asset.

Over the past year, *Mother Jones* and the Investigative Reporting Program at the University of California-Berkeley have examined prosecutions of 508 defendants in terrorism-related cases. Our investigation found:

- * Nearly half the prosecutions involved the use of informants, many of them incentivized by money (operatives can be paid as much as \$100,000 per assignment) or the need to work off criminal or immigration violations.

- * Sting operations resulted in prosecutions against 158 defendants. Of that total, 49 participated in plots led by an FBI operative instigating terrorist action.

- * With three exceptions, all of the high-profile domestic terror plots of the last decade were FBI stings. (The exceptions are Najibullah Zazi, who came close to bombing the New York City subway system in 2009; Hesham Mohamed Hadayet, an Egyptian who opened fire on the El-Al ticket counter at the LA airport; and failed Times Square bomber Faisal Shahzad.)

- * In many sting cases, key encounters between the informant and the target were not recorded—making it hard for defendants claiming entrapment.

- * Terrorism-related charges are so difficult to beat in court, even when the evidence is thin, that defendants often don't risk a trial.

"The defendants would not have done anything if not kicked in the ass by government agents," says

Martin Stolar, a lawyer who represented a man caught in a 2004 sting. "They're creating crimes to solve crimes so they can claim a victory in the war on terror."

In the FBI's defense, supporters argue that the bureau will only pursue a case when the target clearly is willing to participate in violent action. "If you're doing a sting right, you're offering the target multiple chances to back out," says Peter Ahearn, a retired FBI special agent who oversaw the investigation of the Lackawanna Six, an alleged terror cell near Buffalo, New York.

- *Mother Jones*, Sept/Oct 2011 issue

Edward Snowden Is a Patriot

By Anthony D. Romera

Edward Snowden is a patriot.

As a whistleblower of illegal government activity kept secret by all three branches of government - activity that was declared unconstitutional on Monday - he undertook great personal risk for the public good and reignited a debate about surveillance and our most fundamental rights.

For more than 12 years, the ACLU has raised concerns about the rubber stamping of surveillance powers by the judiciary and the clandestine programs that invade the rights of millions with virtually no oversight.

Snowden should be applauded, not vilified. He should be granted full immunity and be allowed to resume his life in the U.S. as a proud American citizen.

Let's examine the arguments as to why he should not be granted immunity and allowed to return home.

First, people may wonder why he took his evidence to journalists rather than to Congress or the executive branch. The simple answer is that Snowden was too smart to expect real results from the "official" channels. Since September 11, 2001, Congress and the courts have failed miserably at providing constitutional oversight. Two ACLU lawsuits that went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court were dismissed because it was impossible to prove that our clients were in fact targeted by these secret government surveillance programs. Absent such proof, which the government was never going to provide, no American would be in a position to challenge the government surveillance programs. Snowden knew that nothing short of public release would get the attention

of the American people, our government and our allies.

The second argument against immunity goes something like this: "Snowden knew he was breaking the law. He should have stayed home and faced the music if he was truly well-intentioned." If he had stayed in the U.S. the government would have arrested him immediately. The laws used against him do not distinguish between patriotic whistleblowers and foreign agents. He would surely have been subjected to "special administrative measures" and would have been prevented from working with the journalists or engaging the broader public debate.

A third argument – often read in *The Wall Street Journal* editorial pages – questions his motivations by the countries in which he received refuge. If Snowden were such a true believer in democracy, he would never have traveled to China or Russia. That argument fails to recognize the massive power of the American government to lean on other governments to repossess one of its most wanted. Recall the full court press of President Obama and Secretary Kerry to ensure that Snowden had no other door except one to an American federal prison. Even those countries that have voiced outrage at the NSA surveillance – Germany, Brazil, Mexico – have failed to offer him political asylum. Their hypocrisy and capitulation to American strong-arming left Snowden with little recourse but to receive help from governments that may have their own agendas in housing someone wanted by the U. S.

Edward Snowden is a great American and a true patriot. My colleagues and I at the ACLU are proud to be his legal advisors. We are committed to assisting him on legal issues he may confront.

Thank goodness for patriots like him, who are willing to endure personal sacrifice to defend truths that we hold self-evident, but which too many Americans take for granted.

-- Readersupportednews.org 19 Dec 13

Orchestrator of violence would "pry your gun from your cold, dead, fingers"

By Lt. Col. Robert Bateman

My job, at the end of the day, is about killing. I orchestrate violence.

I am not proud of that fact. But my profession is about directed violence on behalf of the nation. What is happening inside our country is

disgusting, and living here in England I am at a complete loss as to how to explain this. In 2011 the number of gun deaths in the U.S. was 10.3 per 100,000 citizens. In 2010 that statistic in the UK was 0.25. I can say nothing when my British officers ask me about these things, because it is the law.

Our Supreme Court has been failing us.

You do not have to read *District of Columbia v. Heller* [which ruled in 2008 that the Second Amendment confers an individual right to possess a firearm for lawful purposes]. I can spell it out for you in ten seconds.

Five of the nine members of the Supreme Court agreed that the part in the Second Amendment which talks about "A Well Regulated Militia, Being Necessary To The Security Of A Free State..." did not matter. In other words, they flunked basic high school history.

During the American Civil War state militias formed the basis of the army that saved the United States. Many of the units raised by the states were created from militia units. But even when partially "regulated," militias are sloppy things. They do not always work well outside their own home states, and in our Revolutionary War, it was not uncommon for militia units to refuse to go out of their own state. In the Spanish-American war the way around this was for "interested volunteers" to resign from their militia units and then sign up -- en masse -- as a "volunteer" unit. It was a cumbersome solution to a 123-year-old problem.

Which is why, in 1903 Congress passed the Militia Act. Friends, if you have not read it I'll just tell you: As of 1903, the "militia" has been known as the National Guard.

They are "well regulated," and when called to do so as they have been these past twelve years, they can fight like demons. I am proud of them. And I am ashamed that Justice Scalia thinks that they do not exist.

Guns are tools. But like all tools one must be trained and educated in their use. Weapons are there for the "well regulated militia." Their use, therefore, must be in defense of the nation. Shooting and killing somebody as recently happened because they were not "upset enough" over the loss of a college football team should not be possible in our great nation. Which is why I am adding the following "Gun Plank" to the Bateman-Pierce platform. Here are some suggestions:

1. The only guns permitted will be:

a. Smoothbore or Rifled muzzle-loading blackpowder muskets. No 7-11 in history has ever been held up with one of these.

b. Double-barrel breech-loading shotguns. Hunting with these is valid.

c. Bolt-action rifles with a magazine capacity no greater than five rounds. If you cannot bring down a defenseless deer in under five rounds, then you have no fking reason to be holding a killing tool in the first place.

2. We will pry your gun from your cold, dead, fingers. That is because I am willing to wait until you die, hopefully of natural causes. Guns, except for the three approved categories, cannot be inherited. When you die your weapons must be turned into the local police department, which will then destroy them. (Weapons of historical significance will be de-milled, but may be preserved.)

3. Police departments are no longer allowed to sell or auction weapons used in crimes after the cases have been closed. (That will piss off some cops, since they really need this money. By continuing the process of weapon recirculation, they are only making cops' jobs harder.)

4. We will submit a new tax on ammunition. In the first two years it will be 400 percent of the current retail cost of that type of ammunition. (Exemptions for the ammo used by the approved weapons.) Thereafter it will increase by 20 percent per year.

5. We will initiate a nationwide "buy-back" program, effective immediately, with the payouts coming from the DoD budget. This buy-back program will purchase weapons at 200 percent of their face value the first year, 150 percent the second year, 100 percent the third year. Thereafter there will be a 10 year pause, at which point the guns can be sold to the government at 10 percent of their value for the next 50 years.

6. The major U.S. gun manufactures, less those who create weapons for the federal government and the armed forces, will be bought out by the United States of America, for our own damned good.

-- www.esquire.com/blogs Dec. 3, 2013

Breaking News!

This issue of the *New Jersey Militia Newsletter* has been intercepted by the NSA, the only part of the government that cares enough to listen to us.

Firearm Sales Up + Crime Down = Gun Control Dead

....Today, guns are used in 63% of violent crimes in the U.S. and 69% of murders. The number of U.S. murders and the subset of those murders involving firearms are dropping, however. Murders have diminished 17% since 2003, although 2012 saw a 0.4% uptick compared with 2011. In a country that broadly speaking is getting safer, it's more difficult to get politicians in Washington to risk the wrath of the NRA and support anything described as "gun control."

Apart from politics, dispassionate observers must question the simplistic liberal slogan that more guns equals more crime. The U.S. has seen a two decade period during which private gun ownership has continued to soar (some 300 million firearms are in civilian hands), while crime has diminished....

-- Bloomberg BusinessWeek, Dec. 16-Dec. 23, 2013

I Wrote the *Anarchist Cookbook* in 1969. Now I See Its Premise as Flawed

By William Powell

In December 1969, I quit my job at a bookstore in Greenwich Village to write the *Anarchist Cookbook*. My motivation was simple; the US military seemed single-mindedly determined to send me to fight, and possibly die, in Vietnam.

I wanted to publish something that would express my anger. It seems that I succeeded. The Cookbook is still in print, and I am told it has sold in excess of 2m copies.

I have never held the copyright, and so the decision to continue publishing it has been in the hands of the publisher.

I now find myself arguing for it to be quickly and quietly taken out of print.

My change of heart has had less to do with external events than it does with an internal change.

Over the years, I have come to understand that the basic premise behind the Cookbook is profoundly flawed. The anger that motivated the Cookbook blinded me to the illogical notion that violence can be used to prevent violence. I had fallen for the same irrational pattern of thought that led to US military involvement in both Vietnam and Iraq. The irony is not lost on me.

To paraphrase Aristotle: it is easy to be angry. But to be angry with

the right person, at the right time and to the right degree that is hard - that is the hallmark of a civilized person. Two years ago, I co-authored a book entitled *Becoming an Emotionally Intelligent Teacher*. The premise is that all learning takes place in a social context, and that teachers with a high degree of emotional intelligence construct relationships with students that enhance learning. I continue to work hard, in an Aristotelian sense, to be more civilized.

For the last 40 years, I have served as a teacher and school leader in Africa and Asia. Together with my wife, I have been involved in supporting schools around the world in becoming more inclusive of children with learning challenges. In 2010 we founded, together with other colleagues from international schools, the Next Frontier: Inclusion, a nonprofit organization dedicated to helping schools be more inclusive of children who learn differently - children with developmental delays, dyslexia, ADHD, and autism.

So what is the connection between the needs of these children with learning disabilities and my wish to see the Cookbook go out of print?

The Cookbook has been found in the possession of alienated and disturbed young people who have launched attacks against classmates and teachers. I suspect that the perpetrators of these attacks did not feel much of a sense of belonging, and the Cookbook may have added to their sense of isolation.

I do not know the influence the book may have had on the thinking of the perpetrators of these attacks, but I cannot imagine that it was positive. The continued publication of the Cookbook serves no purpose other than a commercial one for the publisher. It should quickly and quietly go out of print.

-- Guardian UK 20 December 13

Atlantic City Cop Ordered to Pay \$250,000 From Own Pocket to Citizen He Abused

We've seen so many police abuse lawsuits settled before making it to trial where cops admit no wrongdoing while guiltily dishing out thousands of taxpayer dollars that it's surprising to see one actually make it to trial.

And it's absolutely flabbergasting to see it result in a cop ordered personally liable.

The cop is none other than Sterling Wheaton of the Atlantic City Police Department, whom we became

familiar with back in September when he drove up to a group of five fellow officers beating on a suspect and sicced his dog on him in an incident caught on surveillance video.

According to the Press of Atlantic City Michael Troso was a deputy state attorney general when he was arrested at the Trump Marina Restaurant on Aug. 19, 2008. Troso charged that he was beaten by the officers and falsely arrested the night of his bachelor party.

Wheaton must pay half of the award, or \$250,000 in compensatory damages. The jury found he did not owe punitive damages, which are assessed to punish a defendant.

And Wheaton is somehow still a cop.

And now that he needs to pay Troso \$250,000, we can be certain he will be working all the overtime he can get.

-- <http://photographyisnotacrime.com>
2013/12/22/

Commentary: This is a profound change. Police and government officials who commit criminal acts seldom are held personally liable. Instead the agencies they serve are sued and the fines are paid by taxpayers. Hopefully this encouraging change will become a model for dealing with future cases of governmental abuse.

Questions from Maxine

* If 4 out of 5 people suffer from diarrhea...does that mean that one out of five enjoys it?

* Why do croutons come in airtight packages? Aren't they just stale bread to begin with?

* If a pig loses its voice, is it disgruntled?

* If it's true that we are here to help others, then what exactly are the others here for?

* Whatever happened to Preparations A through G?

Obama's EPA closing smelter will not affect ammunition supply

By Emily Miller

Gun owners can rest easy about one aspect of President Obama's agenda. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) decision to close the country's last remaining lead smelter [owned by the Doe Run Co. at Herculaneum, MO] will not cause further ammunition shortages.

Lawrence Keane is the senior vice president for the National

Shooting Sports Foundation (NSSF), which represents the ammunitions and firearms industry.

"Manufacturers use recycled lead to make ammunition. They don't buy from smelters," Mr. Keane told me Monday. "The EPA closing will have no impact on production, supply or cost to the consumers."

American ammunition manufacturers use lead that has been recycled from a variety of everyday products, like car batteries and tire weights.

Ammunition supply has been at historic lows over the last year because demand was off the charts leading up to Mr. Obama's re-election.

Heavy demand continues today because of gun owners' legitimate fears of additional federal and state restrictions on their Second Amendment rights.

Gun owners should be genuinely concerned about ammunition costs skyrocketing due to the recently signed California law that bans lead ammo for hunting in the state.

The new Golden State statute is based on two bogus claims: that lead ammunition kills off wildlife populations and that people can get sick from eating game shot with lead ammo.

Make no mistake, Mr. Obama and his gun-grabbing cohorts around the country want to infringe on the Second Amendment whenever possible. However, in the case of the lead smelter closing, gun owners ought not to be up in arms.

--The Washington Times, Dec. 2, 2013

The Unarmed Truth: My Fight to Blow the Whistle and Expose Fast and Furious, by John Dodson

After the terror attacks of September 11, 2001, John Dodson pulled bodies out of the wreckage at the Pentagon. In 2007, following the shooting massacre at Virginia Tech, John Dodson walked through the classrooms, heartbroken, to cover up the bodies of the victims.

Then came Arizona. The American border.

Ten days before Christmas, 2010, ATF agent John Dodson awoke to the news he had dreaded as a member of the elite team called the Group VII Strike Force: a U.S. border patrol agent named Brian Terry had been shot dead by bandits armed with guns supplied to them by ATF. Was this an inevitable consequence of the Obama administration's Project Gunrunner [known as Fast and Furious], set in place one year earlier ostensibly to track Mexican drug cartels?

Brian Terry's murder would reveal a scandal so unthinkable unpatriotic that it forced President Barack Obama to claim executive privilege and caused Attorney General Eric Holder to be held in contempt of Congress.

Federal Agent John Dodson, an ex-military man, took an oath to defend the world's greatest country, and proudly considered himself a walking patriotic example of the American Dream. Brian Terry, ex-military like Dodson, was only forty years old, a family man who served his country by working for the government.

Dodson was terrified when the next phone call came, one with the potential to destroy his career, his family, and his life. CBS investigative journalist Sharyl Attkisson asked Dodson to go public with what he knew about Fast and Furious. To Dodson, this meant blowing the whistle. But to the family of Agent Terry, it was a chance to save lives and right a wrong. As he took a flight from the border towns of Arizona to a showdown in the halls of Congress, John Dodson clung to the hope that truth would prevail, that he would be redeemed, and that Brian Terry's death would not be in vain.

Like whistle-blowers before him, John would not be welcome back on the job. But he found strength in his conscience, in the support of the American public, and in Senators Darryl Issa and Chuck Grassley. When his first-amendment rights to publicly tell his story were threatened, the ACLU took up his case. For her report

revealing John Dodson as the key whistle-blower in Fast and Furious, Sharyl Attkisson received an Emmy Award for Outstanding Investigative Journalism.

Ultimately, John Dodson was cleared by the Inspector General's office, publicly heralded as a hero, and returned to Arizona.

Perhaps a lesson gleaned from John Dodson's powerful account is well stated by former Speaker of the House of Representatives Sam Rayburn: "If you always tell the truth, you don't have to remember what you said."

-- Amazon.com book blurb, Jan. 2014

Talking To Police - To Talk Or Not To Talk, That Is The Question

It is an unfortunate fact that not all police are helpful. Everything you say can, and usually will be used against you in a court of law. Even if you are in-the-right.

When the police arrive, advise the officers that you were in fear of your life, based upon the actions of the attacker or intruder, and that you had no other alternative but to use deadly force in order to protect yourself or other's lives.

Be careful of your responses or comments to law enforcement officers.

Once you have given some basic information about yourself and your fear of being attacked or potentially being attacked, say nothing more.

Advise the officers that you are now going to exercise your right to remain silent and ask for a lawyer.

Do not fall into the Q&A trap. Remain silent, and again ask for your lawyer.

You may want to add that you might make additional statements, as per your attorney's instructions.

Remain silent until you speak to your lawyers.

Remain firm, but non-combative. — Dan Meadows, Daily Caller.com 2013/10/30

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 783-2375

Wake County, NC, Dave (919) 295-4008

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____